

Title II Project Application
Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

1. **Project Number** (Assigned by federal unit): 118-403 **AMOUNT REQUESTED \$ 77,880**
2. **Project Name:** **Young Stand Management- Pine Conversion, release, and fuels treatments near Marial**
3. **County:** **Curry**
4. **Project Sponsor:** **Jim Brimble, Medford BLM**
5. **Date:** **03-19-03**
6. **Sponsors Ph #:** **1-541-618-2255**
7. **Sponsor's E-mail:** **Jim_Brimble@or.blm.gov**
8. **Project Location** (attach project area maps showing general and specific locations of project.)
- a. 4th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Lower Rogue # 17100310
 - b. 5th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Rogue River Horseshoe Bend #1710031004
 - c. Legal Location: Township 33S Range 10W Section(s) 1,2,3,10,11
 - d. BLM District: Medford
 - e. BLM Resource Area: Glendale
 - f. National Forest: n/a
 - g. Forest Service District: n/a
 - h. State / Private / other lands involved? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

The area to be treated is within a Late-successional Reserve (LSR). The project is designed to accelerate and maintain characteristics of late-successional stands appropriate for the area. The project would accelerate the development of a mixed conifer stand (predominantly a stand of Douglas-fir with a lesser component of pine) within a stand currently dominated by ponderosa pine that was planted after a wildfire in the 1970s (Quail Creek Burn). Follow-up fuels treatments would have as their objective reducing fuels so that the chances of a large fire occurring are reduced.

10. Project Description:

A noncommercial density management treatment (thinning) that favors the retention of late-successional conifer species such as Douglas-fir over ponderosa pine would be done. Pines would be thinned to an average spacing of 17'x17' where conifers are not already at that spacing. Douglas-fir would be released from the influence of adjacent pine when they are greater than half the height of the pine. Douglas-fir when half the height of adjacent pine or less would be spaced on an average spacing of 17'x17'. Brush and most hardwoods would be cut. There would be a 7" dbh upper diameter cut limit on conifers and hardwoods. Selected conifers would be pruned throughout the unit. Conifers would be pruned along the roads to reduce fuel ladders. Concentrations of slash would be handpiled and burned. Treatment would occur on approximately 221 acres.

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?

☐ Yes ☒ No One neighbor has expressed interest in the work which may lead to similar type work on adjacent private land. At this time however, no related projects on adjacent lands are planned or proposed.

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

- Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]
- Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]
- ☒ Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]
- Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

Title II Project Application
Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

13. Project Type (*check one*) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)] | <input type="checkbox"/> Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)] |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)] | <input type="checkbox"/> Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)] |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): _____ [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)] | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)] | <input type="checkbox"/> Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)] |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)] |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)] | <input type="checkbox"/> Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)] |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)] | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]: _____ | |

14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]
(*Use workload measures used for the budget process*)

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| a. Total Acres: | 80 acres |
| b. Total Miles: | _____ n/a |
| c. No. Structures: | _____ n/a |
| d. Estimated People Reached (for environmental education projects): | _____ n/a |
| e. No. Of Laborer Days: | _____ n/a |
| f. Other (specify): | _____ n/a |
| g. Program Element: | JN |

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date [Sec. 203(b)(2)]: April 1, 2007

It is anticipated that from start to finish the project will take approximately forty-two months. Approximately 80 acres would be thinned, released, pruned, and handpiled during the fall/winter of 2003/2004. There would be a period of time through the summer and fall of 2004 to allow the cut material within the handpiles to cure. Burning of the handpiles would be done during late 2004 or early 2005 depending on when weather and fuel moistures came into prescription to allow a safe burn that accomplished fuels objectives. Another 70 acres would be treated similarly starting fall/winter 2004/2005. The final 71 acres would be treated the third year of the project.

16. Target Species (plants/wildlife etc.) Benefited: (if applicable)

Overall conifer vigor within the stand would improve as a result of the treatment. Douglas-fir, a species associated with late-successional stands would benefit as it would receive priority for retention during the treatment. Selected hardwoods would also benefit from the release. In the short-term the treatment would allow more sunlight to reach the forest floor so that forbs and other low plants would remain in the stand. Animal species associated with this lower canopy layer (e.g., some songbirds and small mammals) would benefit. In the long-term, species associated with late-successional forest such as the Northern Spotted Owl would benefit.

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)]

The area burned by the Quail Creek fire includes areas that are private land. There are also other private lands in the general area. Interest in improving habitat and lessening fire hazard has been expressed. The project area is along a backcountry byway which is used by recreationists. Completion of the project would provide an example of some of the types of land management treatments done on public lands.

Title II Project Application
Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities?

Under the Northwest Forest Plan, forest lands managed by the BLM and USFS have been allocated to achieve specific resource objectives. The plan was developed by land managers, scientists and politicians with input from the public. The plan spells out what has been determined as the best use for the land. This project would accelerate the development of late-successional habitat within an LSR. Overall landscape objectives of the plan would be closer to being achieved. Local communities would have the opportunity to bid on work. Money would be spent locally for goods and services.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

n/a

20. Status of Project Planning

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| a. NEPA Complete: | XX Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | Project is part of the Kelsey-Whisky EIS; the Record of Decision has not yet been signed. | |
| b. If No, give est. date of completion: | anticipated last quarter fy03 | | | |
| c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | XX Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: | XX Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| e. Survey & Manage Complete: | XX Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| f. DSL/ODFW* Permits Obtained: | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | XX Not Applicable | |
| g. DLS/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained: | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | XX Not Applicable | |
| h. SHPO* Concurrence Received: | XX Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |
| i. Project Design(s) Completed: | Yes | XX No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | |

* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| XX Contract | XX Federal Workforce |
| County Workforce | <input type="checkbox"/> Volunteers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ | |

22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? (Sec. 204(e)(3))

☐ Yes XX No

Title II Project Application
Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)] *NOTE: This project is not an all or none type project. Treatments could be accelerated should additional funds become available during the first two years. Likewise, should a lesser amount of funds be approved, fewer acres could be done. The acres per fiscal year are estimates. Treatment unit layout would be done to take advantage of features that divided the overall unit into more manageable sub-units.*

Cost Estimate Assumptions:

Estimated Labor costs (mix of permanent and term labor):	\$4300/month
Estimated Vehicle costs (vehicle plus fuel)	\$ 40/day
Estimated Treatment costs (based on past contract work):	
Saw work (spacing/brushing)	\$ 260/acre
Pruning	\$ 125/acre
Handpiling/burning	\$ 500/acre
Overhead costs:	
BLM dollars	22%
Title II dollars	10%

a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$ 77,880

b. Is this a multi-year funding request? ☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, then display by fiscal year

e. FY04 Request: \$ 77,880 (for 80 acres)

f. FY05 Request: \$ 68,145 (for 70 acres)

g. FY06 Request: \$ 69,120 (for 71 acres)

Item	Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution for fy 04 [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Requested County Title II Contribution for fy 04 [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Total Available Funds (as of 3/27/03)
24. Field Work & Site Surveys	0.25 months + vehicle = \$1,075	\$0	\$0	\$0
25. NEPA & Sec.7 ESA Consultation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
26. Permit Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
27. Project Design & Engineering	0.25 months = \$1,075	\$0	\$0	\$0
28. Contract Preparation	0.25 months = \$1,075	\$0	\$0	\$0
29. Contract Administration	0.5 months + vehicle = \$2460	\$0	\$0	\$0
30. Contract Cost	\$0	\$70,800	\$0	\$0
31. Workforce Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
32. Materials & Supplies	\$25	\$0	\$0	\$0
33. Monitoring	\$250	\$0	\$0	\$0
34. Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
35. Project Subtotal	\$5,960	\$70,800	\$0	\$0
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multiple year projects)	\$1,311	\$ 7,080	\$0	\$0
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$ 7,271	\$77,880	\$0	\$0

Title II Project Application
Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding in Column C. Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

n/a

39. Monitoring Plan (Sec.203 (b)(6))

- a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?**

A service contract would be developed to accomplish specific results (tasks) within the project area. A BLM employee (Forester/Forest Technician) would be responsible for the administration (monitoring) of the contract. The BLM employee would not direct the contractor's crew. The employee would be responsible for monitoring the quality of the work while the work is in progress, for notifying the contractor of substandard work and the need to improve work quality, and for final inspection and inspection of rework if necessary. Unit features such as numbers of trees remaining after treatment, selection of trees retained, damage to residual trees, and treatment of cut materials would be evaluated to determine work quality and as a basis of payment to the contractor for work completed.

- b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?**

Details of project and how it was accomplished (#contracts, contractors, typical crew size, etc.) would be forwarded to the District Title II Coordinator.

- c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?**

The project was designed to accelerate the development of late-successional stand characteristics. Although some increase in value may result from the treatment (such as larger piece sizes and a greater amount of clear wood should a future treatment produce a merchantable product), the project was not proposed or designed to produce an economic return/gain. The value of the project would be in the type of habitat that would result in the future and the speed that it develops. Project monitoring would occur as part of the District's RMP monitoring program.

- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33)**

Amount: \$ 250

Implementation monitoring would be done as part of the contract administration. Informal monitoring would consist of periodic visits/walkthroughs.